

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

GARRETT MJ-TALIF SOREZO.,

Plaintiff,

v.

JOE SMITH, BILL NELSON, NASA,

Defendants.

Case No. 24-13476

Honorable Laurie J. Michelson

Magistrate Judge Curtis Ivy, Jr.

**ORDER GRANTING APPLICATION TO PROCEED WITHOUT
PREPAYING COSTS [2] AND DISMISSING COMPLAINT [1]**

Garrett MJ-Talif Sorezo is currently incarcerated at the Gus Harrison Correctional Facility in Adrian, Michigan. He filed this pro se lawsuit against NASA and two of its employees for satellite surveillance and “interfere[ing] with [his] life.” (ECF No. 1, PageID.6.) The complaint fails to state a viable claim and thus, will be summarily dismissed.

I.

The Court first considers Sorezo’s application to proceed without prepayment of fees or costs. (ECF No. 2.) Under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(1), the Court may authorize commencement of an action without prepayment of fees and costs if the plaintiff demonstrates that he cannot pay such fees. Sorezo is incarcerated, unemployed, and has limited funds in his prisoner account statement. (ECF No. 2.) So the Court finds that Sorezo is entitled to proceed in forma pauperis and grants his application. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(1).

II.

But when a Court grants an application under 28 U.S.C. § 1915, it has an additional responsibility: screen the complaint and decide whether it “is frivolous or malicious” or “fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted.” *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B); *see also McGore v. Wrigglesworth*, 114 F.3d 601, 608 (6th Cir. 1997). Although a pro se litigant is entitled to a liberal construction of his pleadings and filings, “a complaint must contain sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, to ‘state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.’” *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 129 S. Ct. 1937, 1949 (2009) (quoting *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007)). Dismissal of the case is appropriate where “the claim is based on an indisputably meritless legal theory[.]” *Wilson v. Yaklich*, 148 F.3d 596, 600 (6th Cir. 1998). Moreover, an IFP complaint “is frivolous where it lacks an arguable basis either in law or in fact.” *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989). Factual frivolousness includes allegations that are “clearly baseless,” “fantastic,” or “delusional.” *Id.* at 327–28.

This applies to Sorezo’s complaint. He says “since [his] birth [he has] been on satellite” and “[he is] satellited 24/7 365 days a year.” (ECF No. 1, PageID.6.) He says “[e]verything [he] love[s] should be without NASA, but they interfere with [his] life,” and claims “[he] would have a better lifestyle if it wasn’t for [NASA].” (*Id.*) He says one can “look over [his] area . . . and see a satellite” and “it causes bad nature.” (*Id.* at PageID.17.) He says NASA has “tried to make [him] weak, less of a man.” (*Id.*) He says he has “los[t] hearing” and wears hearing aids “[be]cause of the tracking.” (*Id.* at PageID.6.) He also describes the loud conditions of the prison he is in and mentions

being assaulted (though it is not clear how this is related to NASA). (*Id.* at PageID.6, 9.) On the form complaint, he identifies his claim as a *Bivens* claim, but then says he is “unsure what Bivens is.” (*Id.* at PageID.4.) He ends his complaint by saying “I am a relative of George Washington the First President. And John Adams. And some other Historians like Daniel Boone, Benjamin Franklin.” (*Id.* at PageID.17.)

These allegations are factually frivolous. *See Neitzke*, 490 U.S. at 325. The Court cannot make out any viable claim from Sorezo’s complaint.

III.

Accordingly, Sorezo’s application to proceed in forma pauperis (ECF No. 2) is GRANTED and his complaint (ECF No. 1) is DISMISSED. A separate judgment will follow.

SO ORDERED.

s/ Laurie J. Michelson
LAURIE J. MICHELSON
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Dated: January 9, 2025